

Appl. No. 10/605,097  
Amtd. dated July 31, 2006  
Reply to Office action of May 11, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### **1. Specification objections**

The specification was objected to because of the lack of a space between certain words. Appropriate corrections have been made to the specification and claim sections.

5 Please note that the Examiner cited the use of "an" instead of "a" before "SRAM" in line 13 of paragraph 0015 as a typographical error. This has not been corrected, as applicant asserts that the article 'an' is conventionally used in conjunction with the term SRAM.

#### **10 2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 1 – 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al.

#### Response

15 In claims 1 and 2, "CD" and "DVD" are amended to read as "first optical disk" and "second optical disk." In claims 13, 14, and 16, "recordable CD" and "DVD" are amended to read as "first recordable optical disk" and "second recordable optical disc." No new matter is introduced.

20 Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the limiting clauses of the claimed invention, namely that reading variables are stored at the same address regardless of the type of optical disk being accessed. Furthermore, the limiting clause "wherein an arrangement of the variable memory is fixed" has been added. These limitations are fully

Appl. No. 10/605,097  
Amtd. dated July 31, 2006  
Reply to Office action of May 11, 2006

supported by Specification paragraph [0017] and Fig.2.

Watanabe discloses a variable memory wherein the memory layout is varied according to a type of optical disk (see Figs. 2, 4 and 5, Watanabe et al.). Furthermore, "The CPU 21 determines a memory arrangement optimum for the optical disc 2 mounted on the optical disc apparatus 1. The determined memory arrangement is output to the arrangement control block 24 as an instruction signal, and based on this instruction signal, the variable memory 25 is actually arranged in the optimum arrangement," [Para. 0063]. The current invention claims a variable memory that has a **fixed layout defining a common reading variable storage area, a reading variable storage area, and a writing variable storage area** (see Fig.2 of the disclosed invention), but the **stored data varies according to the type of optical disk**.

Applicant therefore believes Claim 1 has been placed in a position for allowance. Claims 2 – 7 are dependent on Claim 1 and therefore should be found allowable if Claim 1 is found allowable.

Specifically, regarding claim 5, the applicant asserts that the claimed feature is neither taught nor suggested by Watanabe. Watanabe teaches using the optical disc determination block to identify the class and type of an optical disk mounted on the optical disk apparatus (paragraph [0062]). Therefore, the cited optical disc determination block is unable to identify drive configuration and the Examiner misinterpreted teachings of Watanabe. Additionally, based on Watanabe's teachings, the determination result varies as the inserted optical disk changes. However, as disclosed in specification paragraph [0015] of the present application, "...The common reading variables stored in the first area 24 are utilized when reading all kinds of optical disks..." it is clear that the claimed common reading variables are independent of the type of inserted optical disk. The applicant therefore believes that Watanabe fails to teach storing the common reading variables claimed in claim 5.

Appl. No. 10/605,097  
Amtd. dated July 31, 2006  
Reply to Office action of May 11, 2006

Regarding claim 6, the applicant asserts that the Examiner misinterpreted Watanabe's teachings. Watanabe only teaches storing control information in a fixed position in the variable memory (paragraphs [0066] and [0084]); however, Watanabe does not suggest that the control information stored in the fixed position is never updated or replaced. In addition, as stated above, Watanabe fails to teach storing the claimed common reading variables. Therefore, the applicant asserts that the claimed feature in claim 6 is neither taught nor suggested by Watanabe.

As claims 8 and 13 have been amended to include the same limitations as currently amended Claim 1, applicant believes claims 8 and 13 are also placed in a position for allowance. Claims 9 – 12 and 14 – 18 are dependent on claims 8 and 13 respectively, and should therefore also be found allowable.

Similarly, referring to the above arguments as per claims 5 and 6, the applicant asserts that the claimed features in claims 11 and 12 are neither taught nor suggested by Watanabe. Specifically, regarding claims 16 and 17, the applicant asserts that Watanabe only discloses control information, and does not teach categorizing the control information into reading variables and writing variables and storing the reading variables and writing variables in the variable memory respectively. Therefore, it is clear that Watanabe fails to teach storing the reading variables and writing variables in different positions of the variable memory. In short, the claimed features in claims 16 and 17 are neither taught nor suggested by Watanabe.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/605,097  
Amtd. dated July 31, 2006  
Reply to Office action of May 11, 2006

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 07.31.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)